



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/732,868

12/10/2003

Han-Gu Sohn

8729-226JHM/SS20062US

6860

22150 7590 04/04/2008  
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 WOODBURY ROAD  
WOODBURY, NY 11797

EXAMINER

DARE, RYAN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2186

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/04/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/732,868	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SOHN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RYAN DARE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-10,12-15 and 17-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-10,12-15 and 17-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15, 20-21, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smolansky, et al., US Patent 5,673,396, in view of Takai, US Patent 5,426,606.

4. With respect to claim 1, Smolansky teaches a semiconductor memory device comprising:

an integrated circuit (IC) memory chip comprising an integrated memory circuit and a plurality of address pins, in col. 2, line 67 through col. 3, line 2, wherein the integrated memory circuit comprises:

a memory cell array, col. 3, lines 59-61, any of the memory spaces.

a data buffer for processing data read from or written to the memory cell array, in col. 2, lines 34-35.

a data width control circuit for selectively controlling a data width of the data buffer in response to one or more address bits of an external address signal, in col. 6, line 38, through col. 7, line 9, wherein the data width control circuit comprises:

a decoder for decoding the one or more address bits of external address signal in response to a data access command to generate a first control signal, in col. 6, lines 45-48; and

a data buffer controller, responsive to the first control signal, to generate a second control signal for controlling the data width of the data buffer, in col. 7, lines 23-45.

Smolansky fails to teach exactly how the decoder works in sufficient detail to teach the last limitations of the claim. Takai teaches a decoder comprising a switching circuit; and a logic circuit, wherein the switching circuit is responsive to the data access command in the form of a read command and a write command to pass one or more address bits of the external address signal to the logic circuit and wherein the logic circuit processes the external address signal to generate the first control signal, in col. 10, lines 23-41.

5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Smolansky and Takai before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the memory device of Smolansky with the memory device of Takai as it is a

simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results. The invention of Smolansky uses a decoder to take address bits and supply a control signal. The invention of Takai also uses a decoder to take address bits and supply a control signal. It is known to use a switching and circuit and a logic circuit in the implementation of a decoder, as with Takai, so substituting Takai's decoder for Smolansky would be a substitution leading to predictable results.

6. With respect to claim 3, Smolansky teaches the device of claim 1, wherein the data width control circuit selectively controls the data width of the data buffer by generating a control signal that masks or unmasks one or more bits of the data buffer, in col. 7, lines 23-45.

7. With respect to claim 4, Smolansky teaches the device of claim 3, wherein a masked bit is prevented from being input to the memory cell array from the data buffer, in col. 7, lines 23-45.

8. With respect to claim 5, Smolansky teaches the device of claim 3, wherein a masked bit is prevented from being output from the data buffer, in col. 7, lines 23-45.

9. With respect to claim 6, Smolansky teaches the device of claim 1, wherein the data buffer has a width of  $n$  bits and wherein the data width of the data buffer is selectively controlled to be  $n$  bits or less, in col. 2, lines 34-47.

10. With respect to claims 10 and 12-15, these claims are similar to claims 1 and 3-6, except that they are claimed with an input and output data buffer instead of one data buffer. Smolansky teaches the use of an input and output data buffer in col. 5, lines 42-57. Therefore these claims are rejected using similar logic.

11. With respect to claim 20, Smolansky teaches an integrated circuit (IC) memory device, comprising:

a memory data buffer; and a data width control circuit for selectively varying a data width of the memory data buffer in response to an external control signal applied to one or more address pins of the IC memory device, in col. 6, line 38, through col. 7, line 9.

a decoder for decoding the one or more address bits of external address signal in response to a data access command to generate a first control signal, in col. 6, lines 45-48; and

a data buffer controller, responsive to the first control signal, to generate a second control signal for controlling the data width of the data buffer, in col. 7, lines 23-45.

Smolansky fails to teach exactly how the decoder works in sufficient detail to teach the last limitations of the claim. Takai teaches a decoder comprising a switching circuit; and a logic circuit, wherein the switching circuit is responsive to the data access command in the form of a read command and a write command to pass one or more address bits of the external address signal to the logic circuit and wherein the logic circuit processes the external address signal to generate the first control signal, in col. 10, lines 23-41.

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Smolansky and Takai before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the memory device of Smolansky with the memory device of Takai as it is a

simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results. The invention of Smolansky uses a decoder to take address bits and supply a control signal. The invention of Takai also uses a decoder to take address bits and supply a control signal. It is known to use a switching and circuit and a logic circuit in the implementation of a decoder, as with Takai, so substituting Takai's decoder for Smolansky would be a substitution leading to predictable results.

13. With respect to claim 21, Applicant claims a memory system comprising a controller for generating data access command signals and address signals, and the semiconductor memory device of claim 1, and is therefore rejected using similar logic.

14. With respect to claim 25, Applicant claims a method for providing data I/O width control in a semiconductor memory device similar to claim 1, and is therefore rejected using similar logic.

15. With respect to claim 26, Applicant claims a semiconductor memory device similar to claim 1, and is therefore rejected using similar logic.

16. With respect to claim 27, Applicant claims a semiconductor memory device similar to claim 1, and is therefore rejected using similar logic.

17. Claims 8-9, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smolansky and Takai as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, in view of Miyata, US Patent 4,706,219.

18. With respect to claim 8, Smolansky and Takai teach all other limitations of the parent claim but fail to teach the AND gates. Miyata et al. teach the device of claim 1,

Art Unit: 2186

wherein the logic circuit comprises a plurality of parallel connected AND gates that receive the external address signal, and wherein the first control signal comprises a plural bit signal comprised of the output signals from the AND gates, in col. 6, lines 15-19.

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Smolansky, Takai and Miyata before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the variable data length storage memory of Smolansky and Takai with the variable data length storage memory of Miyata et al., so that a variety of integrated circuit memories can be inexpensively produced at high productivity as a result of having a variable word length, as taught by Miyata in col. 1, lines 39-44.

20. With respect to claim 9, Miyata teaches the device of claim 8, wherein the data buffer controller comprises:

a switching circuit comprising a plurality of parallel connected switches, wherein each switch receives the data access command, and wherein one or more switches are selectively activated in response to the first control signal to generate the second control signal, the second control signal comprise a plural bit signal comprised of the output signals of the switches, in fig. 7.

21. With respect to claims 17-19, these are similar to claims 8-9, except applied to parent claim 10, which contains both an input and an output data buffer. Therefore claims 17-19 are rejected using similar reasoning as claims 8-9.



Art Unit: 2186

22. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smolansky and Takai as applied to claims 20 and 21 above, in view of Hirai, US Patent 5,349,448.

23. With respect to claim 22, Smolansky and Takai teach all limitations of the parent claims, but fail to explicitly describe that the controller is a microprocessor unit. Hirai teaches that the controller for use in the present invention can be a microprocessor unit, in col. 1, lines 32-35.

24. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Smolansky, Takai and Hirai before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the invention of Smolansky and Takai with the invention of Hirai to use a microprocessor unit as a controller in a storage system, because microprocessors are extremely well known in the art as ways to implement a controller.

25. With respect to claim 23, Smolansky and Takai teach all limitations of the parent claims, but fail to explicitly describe that the controller is a network control unit. Hirai teaches that the controller for use in the present invention can be a network control unit, in col. 1, lines 40-41.

26. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Smolansky, Takai and Hirai before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the invention of Smolansky and Takai with the invention of Hirai to use a microprocessor unit as a controller in a storage system, because microprocessors are extremely well known in the art as ways to implement a controller.

27. With respect to claim 24, Smolansky teaches all limitations of the parent claims, but fail to explicitly describe that the controller is a memory controller. Hirai teaches that the controller for use in the present invention can be a memory controller, in col. 1, lines 32-35 and fig.1, where it is obvious that the controller controls image memory and is therefore a memory controller.

28. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Smolansky and Hirai before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the invention of Smolansky with the invention of Hirai to use a microprocessor unit as a controller in a storage system, because microprocessors are extremely well known in the art as ways to implement a controller.

### ***Response to Arguments***

29. Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Takai reference has been supplied to teach the added limitation of these claims.

### ***Conclusion***

30. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar memory systems.

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RYAN DARE whose telephone number is (571)272-4069. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (571)272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Ryan Dare/  
March 30, 2008

/Matt Kim/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2186